UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-NINTH YEAR

2530th MEETING: 19 APRIL 1984

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2530)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East: Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/16472)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2530th MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 19 April 1984, at 6 p.m.

President: Mr. Vladimir A. KRAVETS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, Egypt, France, India, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Peru, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2530)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in the Middle East:
   Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/16472)

The meeting was called to order at 6.15 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:
Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/16472)

1. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Russian*]: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Lebanon in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Fakhoury (Lebanon) took a place at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Russian*]: Members of the Council have before them the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) for the period 13 October 1983 to 9 April 1984 [*S/16472*]. Members of the Council also have before them the following other documents: S/16471, containing the text of a letter dated 9 April 1984 from the representative of Lebanon to the Secretary-General; and S/16491, which contains the text of a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.

3. It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall now put the draft resolution to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: China, Egypt, France, India, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Peru, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The draft resolution was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 2 abstentions [resolution 549 (1984)].

4. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Russian*]: I shall now call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements following the vote.

5. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) [*interpretation from Russian*]: Time and again the Council has had to return to the question of the abnormal situation in Lebanon, a situation which has been caused by Israeli aggression. This matter has become a permanent feature of the activities of the Council for six years now. Indeed, the Council may have devoted more time and attention to Lebanon than to any other country. The already lengthy list of resolutions adopted on this item continues to grow. Eventually, the chronic failure to implement Council resolutions on Lebanon may come to be regarded as commonplace and normal.

6. Such a situation cannot but cause grave concern. In the opinion of the Soviet delegation, the time has now come for the Council to take another serious look at the root causes of the dangerous tension which has turned Lebanon into a constantly smouldering source of war. I am referring, of course, to the Israeli aggression against Lebanon and to Israel's continued illegal occupation of more than a third of Lebanese territory.

7. In its resolution 425 (1978), adopted almost six years ago after Israel's invasion of Lebanon in March 1978, the Council demanded that Israel cease its aggression and withdraw its troops behind the internationally recognized borders of Lebanon. As the Council is aware, that resolution has remained virtually unim-

plemented, and the United Nations Interim Force that was created on the basis of that resolution has, as it were, received a permanent mission in southern Lebanon.

8. In the light of the new, even larger-scale, bloody aggression in Lebanon that was unleashed by Israel in June 1982, the Council unanimously adopted resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), in which it demanded the immediate cessation of all military actions in Lebanon and the unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanese territory. That demand was reconfirmed in subsequent resolutions of the Council.

9. However, to date all those resolutions continue to be blatantly ignored by Tel Aviv, and the Zionist occupiers continue to lord it over Lebanese soil. The hundreds of thousands that have been killed and injured, the towns and villages that have been destroyed and the misdeeds in the Palestinian camps of Sabra and Shatila are by no means a complete list of the crimes committed by the Israeli military machine.

10. We can only regard this as a continuation of the expansionist policy pursued by Israeli ruling circles, which are hatching plans to divide up Lebanon and making use of the experience as occupiers they have acquired on the West Bank of the River Jordan, in the Gaza Strip and the Golan Heights. The blood and suffering of the Lebanese and other Arab peoples have fed the ill-fated strategic alliance between Tel Aviv and Washington: no longer a mere conniver, Washington has become a direct accomplice in Israeli aggression. As is perfectly obvious, Israel's aggression against Lebanon in June 1982 was from the very outset prepared with the knowledge of the United States.

11. In his memoirs, which have just been published, the former Secretary of State of the United States, Alexander Haig, gives the following very telling account of events. As far back as October 1981 the then Prime Minister of Israel, Mr. Begin, informed Haig that Israel had started to plan its invasion of Lebanon. Nevertheless, a month later, in November, the United States signed a memorandum on strategic co-operation with Israel. In mid-January 1982, Mr. Begin once again reminded Haig that Israel was preparing to attack southern Lebanon. In February 1982, at a meeting with Haig in Washington, the Commander of Israeli military intelligence made it clear that Israeli troops that had invaded Lebanon intended to advance right up to the southern suburbs of Beirut. In other words, the United States already had a clear idea of the scope of the new act of aggression being prepared by Israel. In the beginning of May 1982, Begin warned the United States that the Israeli invasion of Lebanon was becoming, as he expressed it, imperative and inevitable. Finally, at the end of May, both Begin and Sharon told their American allies that Israel's decision to invade Lebanon was final and irreversible. That is the history of how Israel's aggression was prepared.

12. How did the United States conduct itself in these circumstances? As can be seen from the same memoirs, it simply advised Israel to find some sort of excuse for the invasion, for otherwise, as the Israelis were told by Haig, American public opinion might not tolerate such an operation. The conclusion is that the United States was aware of Israel's planned aggression against Lebanon eight months before it actually began. It was regularly in consultation with Israel at all stages of preparation. But the United States not only did nothing to stop the invasion; it continued to supply Israel with weapons and military *matériel*, making it possible for the invasion to take place through its material support. That is why—and this is now quite irrefutable—Israel's aggression against Lebanon was virtually a joint American-Israeli aggression.

13. The following stage of the United States involvement in the war against the Arabs was the introduction of American fighting troops in Lebanese territory under the banner of so-called multinational forces and their ensuing land, sea and air bombardment of the Arab population. So here we have it: two sides of the same coin, the aggression of Israel and the aggression of the United States against the Arabs. That, then, is American-Israeli strategic co-operation in action.

14. In connection with the situation that now obtains in southern Lebanon, it is the profound conviction of the Soviet delegation that the Security Council faces an extremely important problem. One may legitimately ask how long the principal organ of the United Nations, the Security Council, can acquiesce in Israel's continuing occupation of the territory of a neighbouring Member State. How long will it continue to allow the aggressor and its protectors to ignore with impunity its numerous resolutions when their strict implementation is an obligation incumbent upon all States Members of the Organization? There can be no doubt as to the answer to that question: the Council cannot, nor should it, acquiesce in such a situation, when, as a result of Israel's stubborn refusal to put an end to its occupation of Lebanese territory, the aggressor, in defiance of the entire world, continues to grow in strength on the lands it has seized and United Nations forces are unable to perform the main task they have been given by the Council—that is, to ensure supervision of the withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanon.

15. It is the bounden duty of the Security Council to insist that Israel unconditionally fulfil the previously adopted decisions demanding that an end be put to the Israeli aggression in Lebanon.

16. In the light of the request by the Lebanese Government and the recommendations of the Secretary-General, the Soviet delegation feels that there is no particular objection at the present stage to extending the mandate of UNIFIL for the next regular period. At the same time, however, it is our assumption that during that period the Council will take every step necessary to put an end to the Israeli occupation. If

Israel nevertheless fails to withdraw its troops from Lebanon, the Council will have to—we stress: will have to—carry out the task entrusted to it by the Charter and consider the adoption of effective practical steps in response to those circumstances. We can no longer continue to acquiesce in Israel's occupation of Lebanese territory and its concomitant disregard of Council decisions.

17. The Soviet delegation takes this opportunity to confirm once again the Soviet Union's fundamental position of principle with regard to UNIFIL. First, the maintaining of the Force on Lebanese territory should in no wise impinge upon Lebanon's sovereign rights. Secondly, UNIFIL should not be entrusted with functions not in accordance with its duties as defined by the Charter; nor should it intervene in Lebanon's affairs. Thirdly, full account should be taken of Israel's responsibility, as the aggressor, for the deeds it has perpetrated.

18. In this connection, we confirm that all the expenses related to dealing with the consequences of Israel's armed aggression against Lebanon should be borne by the aggressor itself. For that reason, the Soviet Union, as in the past, will not participate in defraying expenses connected with the establishment and functioning of UNIFIL.

19. Mr. CLARK (United States of America): Members of the Council have unanimously agreed that the resolution just adopted does not in any way go beyond resolution 538 (1983), but simply extends it. It was with this understanding that the United States voted in favour of the resolution.

20. Mr. LOUET (France) [*interpretation from French*]: The Security Council has just once again renewed the mandate of UNIFIL. By according its support to the Council's decision, the French delegation has demonstrated France's support for the United Nations role in Lebanon and the importance it attaches to UNIFIL's complete fulfilment of the task assigned to it by resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978).

21. In this connection, my delegation cannot but share the concerns expressed by the Secretary-General in his report issued in connection with the renewal of the Force's mandate. UNIFIL has not been able to live up completely to the hopes that the international community, represented by the Council, and the Lebanese people, victim of an interminable conflict, had placed in it. The Israeli invasion of June 1982 in fact radically changed the conditions in which UNIFIL acts. The Israel Defence Forces continue to operate, in violation of Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), in the Force's deployment area. That is the main reason for the difficulties encountered by UNIFIL in fulfilling its tasks. It is to be hoped that this abnormal situation will soon come to an end, so that Lebanon's integrity and its Government's authority can be restored within its internationally recognized boundaries, pursuant to resolution 520 (1982).

22. All the inhabitants of southern Lebanon aspire to peace. UNIFIL should be in a position to ensure more effective protection and greater security for the civilian population of that region.

23. My delegation has noted with great interest the observations made by the Secretary-General in his report, and particularly the idea of having the Council consider at the appropriate time a future course of action that would make the Force's mandate more effective. France shares the Secretary-General's view that the re-establishment of peace and stability in southern Lebanon, under the authority and sovereignty of the Lebanese Government, "represents, in the long run ... the best guarantee of security for all concerned" [*S/16472, para. 26*]. UNIFIL can make a useful contribution to that development. That is why France is prepared to consider the new tasks that the Council might in due course see fit to entrust to UNIFIL. We are prepared, especially if a request to this effect is made in due course by the Government of Lebanon, to consider the extension of UNIFIL's mandate and deployment area. It is in that spirit that France will co-operate with the Secretary-General in the fulfilment of the mandate just given him.

24. Before concluding, I would pay a tribute to the persevering work done by UNIFIL's officers and soldiers, who have constantly discharged their obligations with courage and dedication, in particularly delicate circumstances.

25. France, which contributes the largest number of troops to UNIFIL, is fully aware of the effort made by the countries contributing to the Force. We understand the concerns of some of our partners at the often-frustrating conditions in which their troops operate. We hope that a satisfactory solution may quickly be found to the financing problems emphasized by the Secretary-General in paragraph 27 of his report. None the less, France is convinced that it is important to maintain in southern Lebanon a United Nations presence that could, in what we hope will be the near future, prove to be a crucial factor in the re-establishment of peace and security in that region.

26. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt) [*interpretation from Arabic*]: The delegation of Egypt views the endorsement by the Council of the extension of the mandate of UNIFIL for another six months as further evidence of the international community's continued commitment to support the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon, as expressed in numerous resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

27. The delegation of Egypt supports the statement by the Secretary-General in his last report, which included a call for restoring the situation in southern Lebanon to normal. We agree in fact with the comments made by the Secretary-General at the end of the report, and we cannot fail to note the earlier references therein to the

marked increase in hostility on the part of the local population to the presence of the Israel Defence Forces. Such hostility is a natural result of any occupation.

28. The Lebanese Government considers UNIFIL's continued presence in Lebanon indispensable and imperative, as is reflected in the letter of its representative of 9 April, in which he requests the extension of UNIFIL's mandate for another six months, under the same terms of reference set forth in resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978), among other relevant Council resolutions.

29. We, too, feel that the UNIFIL presence in Lebanon is an important expression of the United Nations commitment to support the Lebanese Government in its efforts to regain complete control and authority over southern Lebanon. Hence, we supported the draft resolution which was put to the vote a few moments ago.

30. Egypt's position is well known: on previous occasions, both inside and outside the United Nations, we have consistently called for the complete withdrawal of foreign forces—in particular those of Israel—from Lebanese territory. We wish today to reiterate that position by quoting the official joint communiqué issued at Cairo on 11 April 1984 following the official visit to Egypt by President André-Dieudonné Kolingba of the Central African Republic. Presidents Mubarak and Kolingba called for the complete and immediate withdrawal of the Israeli forces from Lebanese territory in accordance with Security Council resolutions. The two Presidents expressed support for all efforts aimed at achieving conciliation in Lebanon and the preservation of its independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity.

31. Mr. van der STOEL (Netherlands): When the Council extended the mandate of UNIFIL in October 1983, I informed the Council of my Government's decision to retain a limited contingent with the Force in southern Lebanon. In close co-operation with both the Secretary-General and UNIFIL headquarters at Naqoura, the Netherlands battalion has since been repatriated and replaced by a reinforced infantry company of the strength of approximately 165 men. I may also recall that the main reason for our decision to maintain a presence in UNIFIL has been our conviction that UNIFIL still could and should play a more meaningful role than the Force is able to fulfil at present. I need not recall here that the tasks currently carried out by UNIFIL, in particular the humanitarian assistance rendered to the local population in its area of operation, together with its contribution to peace and stability in southern Lebanon, however beneficial these may be, do not conform to the original mandate as spelt out in resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978), nor to the intentions of later Council resolutions on the withdrawal of Israeli forces and the restoration of the authority of the Lebanese Government in southern Lebanon.

32. We strongly concur with the observation of the Secretary-General in his latest report on UNIFIL that a return to genuine peace and normality in southern Lebanon would be in the interest of virtually all. We are pleased to note a more general recognition of UNIFIL's stabilizing role in southern Lebanon and of the important role the Force could play in changing for the better the situation in that region. The Secretary-General has suggested in his report that the Council

> "consider at the appropriate time, and without prejudice to arrangements elsewhere in Lebanon, a future course of action which would make more effective the mandate of UNIFIL specifically in southern Lebanon, in the context of the withdrawal of Israeli forces from that area" [*ibid., para. 25*].

33. We commend the Secretary-General for the ideas he has put forward and for the consultations he has undertaken in recent weeks on further means to achieve the objectives of an Israeli withdrawal, the restoration of peace and normality and the re-establishment of the authority and sovereignty of the Lebanese Government in southern Lebanon in conformity with resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978), and other relevant Council resolutions. For our part, we stand ready to vote for any Council resolution providing for a better framework for the attainment of these objectives, with which all parties would seem to concur. As one of the troop contributors, we feel that a Council decision that would reactivate the role of UNIFIL is already long overdue.

34. In his report, the Secretary-General has also cautioned that one should not underestimate the difficulties of working out a plan directed to the attainment of these overall objectives—a plan which would at the same time meet the rights and interests of the Government and people of Lebanon and the concerns of all those now involved in southern Lebanon. Notwithstanding these difficulties, we think the time has come for all parties involved to reconsider seriously the role UNIFIL could play in the re-establishment of peaceful, normal conditions in southern Lebanon, which, as the Secretary-General has pointed out, would represent in the long run the best hope for the future and the best guarantee of security for all.

35. We therefore urge all parties concerned to make appropriate use of the potential of United Nations peace-keeping operations to restore international peace and security in the region. Failure to grasp the opportunities which seem to present themselves now could have grave consequences later. Moreover, it is also evident that the international community—which at great costs, particularly for the troop-contributing countries, has maintained UNIFIL in the region for almost two years since the Israeli invasion of Lebanon—cannot be expected to support Lebanon indefinitely.

36. In this connection, I may be forgiven if I draw the Council's attention once more to the financial difficul-

ties faced by UNIFIL. We read in the report of the Secretary-General that, as of the beginning of April 1984, the accumulated shortfall in the UNIFIL Special Account has risen to some $186.4 million. We are all aware that some Member States consistently fail to honour their obligations, thereby creating major financial problems for the Organization and for the troop contributors, for that matter. The Secretary-General has shown himself extremely concerned about this state of affairs, which indeed could jeopardize the whole concept of peace-keeping operations.

37. Lastly, although UNIFIL has been set up by the Council for the purpose of facilitating the withdrawal of Israeli forces from southern Lebanon, it would be unfair and unrealistic to ignore the other aspects of the crisis in Lebanon, which need to be addressed urgently as well. Let me therefore briefly restate the position of my Government: we continue to be deeply concerned about the situation in and around Beirut and we again call on all parties concerned to refrain forthwith from the use of force and to agree promptly to a cease-fire. We once more wish to stress the need for a resumption without further delay of the process of conciliation and negotiation aimed at the establishment of a government enjoying the widest possible national support and exercising authority throughout the territory of Lebanon. Such a government would be in a much stronger position to assert its authority and to accomplish the desired goal of a complete withdrawal of all non-authorized non-Lebanese forces from Lebanese territory. The position of my Government on this issue remains unchanged: we fully support the territorial integrity, unity, sovereignty and independence of Lebanon, and it is clear that this requires the withdrawal of all unauthorized foreign forces from Lebanese territory.

38. Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): The continuing plight of the Lebanese people touches most, if not all of us. The Council has a duty to do all it can to help restore the peace and stability which they seek and to uphold the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of their State.

39. In his letter of 9 April to the Secretary-General, the representative of Lebanon stated that his Government believed that the time might have come for the Security Council to reassess the mission of UNIFIL so that it could perform a more dynamic role. My Government agrees with this and has long advocated an expanded United Nations presence in Lebanon. We much regretted that the Council was prevented, two months ago, from taking action to strengthen the United States presence in Beirut. We are pleased, therefore, that the Secretary-General has proposed in his report to the Council that UNIFIL should be enabled in the near future to play an expanded role. This is both helpful and constructive. We welcome the soundings which he has already taken with the parties concerned. We believe that this is the right way to proceed and we support the objectives which he has set out in his report. As he rightly states, all concerned have common interests in changing the situation in southern Lebanon for the better.

40. For our part, the United Kingdom is ready at the appropriate time to consider with the rest of the Council the future course of action suggested by the Secretary-General. We hope that other Council members will join us in encouraging the Secretary-General to continue his exploration of the possibilities with the parties concerned. We interpret the resolution we have just adopted as endorsing further action by the Secretary-General on these lines. For this reason, and because we support in the meantime the further extension of UNIFIL's existing mandate, we were pleased to vote in favour of the resolution. My delegation regrets that two delegations have not felt able to support this otherwise universally praised peace-keeping action by the United Nations.

41. I am obliged once again to draw attention to the grave financial difficulties confronting UNIFIL. My delegation echoes the Secretary-General's extreme concern at this unacceptable state of affairs. We join with him in calling on the States concerned to pay their assessments without delay.

42. Finally, I should like to take this opportunity once more to pay tribute to General Callaghan, his staff, the officers and men of UNIFIL and the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization military observers, for their continued dedication to their task.

43. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Russian*]: I call upon the representative of Lebanon.

44. Mr. FAKHOURY (Lebanon) [*interpretation from Arabic*]: Mr. President, allow me at the outset to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of April and to thank you for your efforts to promote the success of the consultations on renewal of UNIFIL's mandate. Those efforts reflect your statesmanship and experience.

45. Allow me also to extend thanks to your predecessor, Mr. Arias Stella, the representative of Peru, President of the Council during the month of March, for his excellent and tactful conduct of the Council's work.

46. Once more Lebanon requests a six-month renewal of the UNIFIL mandate, on the basis of the terms defined in resolution 426 (1978).

47. UNIFIL, about whose situation the Secretary-General spoke in detail in his report of 9 April 1984, has been unable, for reasons well known to everyone here which I see no need to repeat now, to discharge in full the mandate assigned it by the Council.

48. UNIFIL still has a long way to go to discharge and complete its mission in the best possible manner. In this connection, the report of the Secretary-General recommended an extension of UNIFIL's mandate and a fu-

ture course of action to make it more effective. I requested a reassessment of the Force in my letter dated 9 April addressed to the Secretary-General. My Government believes that time may have come for the Council to reassess the mission of UNIFIL in the light of the dangers looming over occupied southern Lebanon and their effects on that population. Hence, we strongly support the contents of the report of the Secretary-General, his comments on the future of UNIFIL, and the initiative he called for, in consultation with the Lebanese Government and the parties concerned, to enable UNIFIL to achieve the objectives of resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) and other relevant resolutions.

49. In addition, we strongly support the Secretary-General's proposal for the temporary deployment of UNIFIL, with elements of the Lebanese army and internal security forces, in areas vacated by Israeli forces. Similarly, we strongly support UNIFIL's expanded deployment to assist in the restoration of Lebanese authority and sovereignty up to the internationally recognized boundary, as well as the working out of the necessary arrangements to ensure the speedy transformation of southern Lebanon into a zone of peace under the sovereignty and authority of the Lebanese Government.

50. My Government also hopes that the main arterial roads in the south will soon be brought under UNIFIL supervision. My Government calls for an opening of all crossing points and roads leading to the south. We call for an end to all activities being carried out against the civilian Lebanese population and officials.

51. The conditions prevailing in southern Lebanon are extremely grave, and the measures taken by the Israeli authorities, including blocking the main highway to the south, lead to the dismemberment of southern Lebanon and its partitioning from Lebanon and subject it to economic and security regulations that have adverse effects on the status of the population there. Southern Lebanon is part and parcel of the Lebanese homeland. Peace throughout Lebanon is closely bound to the question of southern Lebanon and its fate.

52. In this connection, it is imperative to affirm categorically that the Lebanese Government does not recognize any military formations or commands that have not been officially and legitimately established or appointed. Hence it does not recognize or deal on any level or in any context with any such artificial military formations and commands, including the so-called Army of South Lebanon, or Lahad's army.

53. The Council's responsibility in this question is both direct and of great importance because it is charged with the preservation of international peace and security and, hence, with responsibility for the peace and security of any Member State in the world whose citizens are beset by the same suffering being inflicted on the population of southern Lebanon. The peoples of the world look to the Council as virtually their last chance to put an end to their sufferings and their tragic situation. The Council's positive response to any rightful demand enhances the confidence of the peoples of the world that, in the end, there is an authority to which they can have recourse, one that will assist them in achieving their hopes and aspirations to live in peace and security.

54. In view of the critical conditions that exist at present in southern Lebanon, we regard the resolution adopted by the Council today as a further step forward in the discharge of UNIFIL's basic mission. We also regard it as a point of departure for serious initiatives, under the Council's supervision, to be undertaken personally by the Secretary-General.

55. In conclusion, I must, on behalf of the Government and people of Lebanon, express great thanks to the Secretary-General for his report, which is characteristically clear and candid and which includes practical and realistic elements and a comprehensive outlook inspired by his sincere desire to contribute effectively to the restoration of peace and security in southern Lebanon. I should also like to extend thanks to the States participating in UNIFIL and to their troops in southern Lebanon under the command of Lieutenant-General Callaghan, as well as to all his staff, civilian and military, for their praiseworthy work under conditions that are, to put it mildly, extremely difficult, in view of the fact that circumstances do not yet allow UNIFIL to discharge its mission as expected.

56. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Russian*]: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have just received a letter from the representative of Israel in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Blum (Israel) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

57. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Russian*] The representative of Israel has asked to speak. I therefore invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

58. Mr. BLUM (Israel): At the outset, permit me to express to you, Sir, my respects on your assumption of the presidency for this month. May I also take this opportunity to express our warm appreciation to the representative of Peru for the very able and effective manner in which he carried out the functions of the presidency last month.

59. It had not been my intention to intervene in this debate. However, in view of the highly intemperate and

grossly inaccurate statements made by some of the speakers here today, I feel constrained to restate my Government's position on the matter before us —which, may I remind certain members of the Council, is the extension of the mandate of UNIFIL.

60. As I have repeatedly had occasion to state in the Council, it is my Government's view that, in the circumstances surrounding the situation in Lebanon since June 1982, UNIFIL has outlived its usefulness in southern Lebanon and its presence is no longer called for there. As was rightly stated by the Secretary-General in his report on UNIFIL dated 14 October 1982, the events of 1982 had "radically altered the circumstances in which UNIFIL was established and under which it had functioned since March 1978" [*S/15455, para. 17*]. Likewise, in his report on UNIFIL dated 12 October 1983 the Secretary-General again stated that those events "radically altered the conditions under which UNIFIL was created and is intended to function" [*S/16036, para. 21*]. The growing recognition to this effect is also evidenced by the position adopted in recent months by a number of contributing countries which, seeing no effective mission for UNIFIL in its present area of deployment, have accordingly reduced their troops in the field.

61. It is Israel's position that the security of southern Lebanon should eventually be guaranteed by Lebanese forces. At the same time, Israel believes that UNIFIL could perform a useful role by serving as a buffer separating the Israel Defence Forces and the Syrian forces currently in Lebanon. Likewise, in the view of the Government of Israel, UNIFIL could fulfil a useful function north of the area of deployment of the Israel Defence Forces, where it could serve as a genuine peace-keeping force. With regard to the possibility of UNIFIL's deployment there, including the Sidon area, the Government of Israel would be prepared to consider and discuss this matter in due course.

62. As for the Secretary-General's recent report on UNIFIL, in general my Government has reservations in regard to many of the remarks, statements and observations contained therein. Some of these reservations have already been communicated to the Secretary-General. I will therefore confine myself here today to the following remarks.

63. First, the resolutions of the Council referred to in paragraph 22 of the Secretary-General's report cannot be regarded by Israel as the basis for consideration by the Council of the issue before us, in view of the fact that the situation on the ground clearly demonstrates that it is not Israel's military presence in the southern part of Lebanon that lies at the root of Lebanon's instability. Regrettably, the report makes no mention of the presence of Syrian and terrorist forces in Lebanon, of their well-documented responsibility for destabilizing that country as a whole and of their role in depriving the Lebanese Government of its authority by arrogating that authority to themselves. Consequently, the Government of Israel cannot accept the overall approach reflected in paragraph 25 of the report.

64. Secondly, it is equally regrettable that the Secretary-General's report makes no mention of those resolutions of the Council which call for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Lebanese territory, as for example resolution 520 (1982).

65. Thirdly, Israel likewise regards paragraph 16 of the report as incomplete in its treatment of the numerous terrorist incidents in the area. This is further compounded by the fact that the identity of the perpetrators of those terrorist acts is omitted.

66. I have deliberately refrained in my statement from responding to some provocative and inflammatory statements made earlier here containing the customary distortions regarding the situation in Lebanon as a whole. My Government's position on that question is well known and requires no repetition here. Since the matter on the agenda is the extension of UNIFIL's mandate, which apparently seems to have been forgotten by the representative of the Soviet Union, I have confined myself in my statement to the issues properly related to the item on the agenda. Any outburst such as the outburst of the representative of the Soviet Union which we have heard here earlier in this meeting is in our view hardly worthy of comment in a civilized debate.

67. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) [*interpretation from Russian*]: Today's statement by the representative of Israel is typical on two scores: first, there is no reference in his statement to any intention on Israel's part to withdraw its forces from Lebanon; secondly, his statement clearly reflects Israel's designs on southern Lebanon and Israel's notion that it can there promulgate its own régime. This once again confirms the propriety of the Soviet delegation's raising the matter. Indeed, it is time the Council seriously considered how to force Israel to withdraw its troops from Lebanon.

68. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Russian*]: The representative of Israel has asked to exercise his right of reply. I therefore invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

69. Mr. BLUM (Israel): It is indeed not my intention to be drawn into a debate by the representative of the Soviet Union, who uses every opportunity to divert attention from agenda items before the Council. He has now appointed himself to be the official interpreter of my statement. Members of the Council have heard my statement and I think they will all readily agree—with the exception, of course, of the representative of the Soviet Union—that his interpretation of my statement is as accurate as was his presentation of facts before; but then, of course, we have all become accustomed to his customary departures from the truth, and we should have been surprised if for once he had stuck to the truth.

70. We have been told by the representative of the Soviet Union that Lebanon has been discussed in the Council perhaps more than any other issue. I am sure he has checked on his facts—he always does—but then, of course, one should not be surprised. Afghanistan obviously could not be discussed in the Council because the representative of the Soviet Union saw to that. The ongoing massacre carried out in Afghanistan by the forces of his country cannot be discussed in the Council. He has seen to that. Nor can the very strong indications of the use by the Soviet Union of chemical and bacteriological warfare against the Afghan people be discussed in the Council. Instead, of course, it is much more convenient for him to give a distorted presentation of the situation in Lebanon, including what he believes to be the root causes of that situation.

71. Well, Ambassador Ovinnikov, the root causes lie elsewhere. You are familiar with them because your country is directly involved in them. Your country directly and indirectly, through its well-known stooges in the region, which I will not name because all of us know them, has been instrumental in destabilizing Lebanon for a decade and more. Those are the root causes, and you cannot divert attention from them by engaging the Council in your periodic book reviews of American authors. I am sure we all appreciate your book reviews and your recommendations as to what we ought to read and what we should not read. But the time has come for you to recommend some interesting memoirs of the Soviet leadership, which you have not done to date for reasons you would, I am sure, care to elaborate on.

72. All this exposé on the alleged root causes of the situation in Lebanon is given by the representative of a country which over the years has not contributed one penny to the peace-keeping operations in Lebanon and which never supported the establishment of UNIFIL in the first place, or the subsequent extensions of its mandate.

73. Now, this argument obviously was intended to be pre-empted in the statement of Ambassador Ovinnikov. But the facts remain the facts and cannot be explained away. It is standard tactics on the part of Soviet representatives to try and lead a debate on matters, while, when it comes to the financial implications of those matters, they are rather reluctant to join in.

74. I should like to ask one question, in the same vein in which Ambassador Ovinnikov asked it; I will only change one word in that question. How long does he think the United Nations can acquiesce in the ongoing Syrian occupation of Lebanon, which, together with the terrorist presence in that country, is the root cause of the tragedy of that country?

75. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Russian*]: There are no further speakers. The Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 7.25 p.m.